

Now, they put the bill out and it is going to cost the state millions of dollars because they also put a bill out, LB 470, that allegedly is going to raise the state some money. Is there a guarantee that 470 is going to pass? Are the votes there? I don't know. I don't know. But evidently that was the reasoning of the Revenue Committee. Now, Senator Nelson mentioned this is class legislation. Interestingly enough, when I introduced LB 600 which would have raised a minimum of \$3 million for the state, a minimum, that was a conservative estimate and I asked Senator Johnson later, I said, do you know why the committee killed the bill? I said, I'm not going to live or die with it, I'm just curious. And he said, well, they felt like it was kind of a class legislation, picking on one industry, and they already were paying a sales tax so why put a luxury tax on them? Well, Senator Scofield had a bill similar to mine but dealt with a different type of industry. So I think Senator Nelson is right, this is special class legislation and I accepted the fact that they killed my bill because it was picking on one industry. Now we are favoring one industry. Now we're going to write a bill that is going to cost the state millions of dollars for an exemption for farmers. I wonder if there is as many farmers as there are businessmen in all the towns across the state that would like to have an exemption on their computers, on their typewriters, on the various things that you need to run an office. I just don't understand our Revenue Committee putting out bills at a time when we are looking at a millions of dollar shortfall. They killed the bills that would raise the money and they put out the bills that will cost us more money. So what you are doing here today is shooting craps. Those of you that are opposed to gambling, that's what you're going to do now. We're going to gamble that if we advance LB 185, whether it is amended or not, then we have to pass LB 470 to offset LB 185, if you can believe the Chairman of the Revenue Committee. So I think that is a dangerous thing to do. If you want to give away these millions of dollars today, gamble that the votes will be there to recover it whenever 470 comes up, and I think I'll vote for the Warner amendment because I kind of like it. I think it's fair. It doesn't discriminate. It is just saying we've got to replace this money some way and passing this amendment is a sure way of doing it, then gambling on 470 sometime in the future. So I would urge the body to adopt the Warner amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Howard Lamb, on the Warner amendment, followed by Senators Hall and Hefner.